



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,550	11/15/2001	Yasuhisa Hayashi	216099US2	7362

22850 7590 08/28/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,550

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/15/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chestnut (U.S. Patent 6,041,114).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Chestnut discloses a system and method for managing call forwarding. Calls are forwarded based upon the device used to log onto the computer network by the called party. The communication terminal ("caller 30") placed a call on the PSTN 6, and is sent a call forwarding destination information including information on at least a call forwarding destination ("the caller is provided with a list of locations"); and the caller selects a call forwarding destination ("...any of which can be selected by the caller and tried in order to locate the called party") and allows the communication terminal and the call forwarding destination to communicate with each other according the information on the call forwarding destination (col. 3, lines 8-42).

Regarding claims 2 and 11, Chestnut teaches establishing a communication mode ("distinguish between internal extensions 10, outside lines 28, cell phones, Internet voice, home fax 24, voice messaging system 18, and two way pagers") between

Art Unit: 2642

the communication system and the communication terminal according to the information on the call forwarding destination (col. 3, lines 51-60 and col. 4, lines 36-57).

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Chestnut teaches the caller is presented with different lists of potential forwarding telephone numbers to select, before the PBX 4 sends the call to the called party, the telecommute server 2 checks the computer network to see if the called party is logged on what device, for example, fax, voice messaging system, phone (communication mode is voice) reads on claimed "...caller selects a communication mode...establishing the communication mode selected by the caller between the communication system and the communication terminal".

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Chestnut teaches the telecommute server checks and instructs the PBX 4 to forward the call to the telephone extension associated with the device the called party has used to log onto the computer network or sends the incoming call to the voice messaging system if the called party is not logged onto the computer network, therefore, the telecommute server is inherently comprised a media conversion part for performing media conversion between communication modes.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 4.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 17, and 18, Chestnut teaches indicating call forwarding is available or not and sending call forwarding information (col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2642

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chestnut (U.S. Patent 6,041,114).

Regarding claims 6, 7, 15, and 16, Chestnut teaches that the system checks to see if calls are being forwarded or not (col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 20). However, Chestnut does not suggest a part for storing the call forwarding destination information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that if there is the list of call forwarding information and user can modify the list, then the list of call forwarding information would have to be stored somewhere within the system.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McKendry et al. (U.S. Patent 6,058,178) teach a method for routing incoming calls to a user's premises on a POTS telephone line. In one embodiment, personal call manager 100 presents the caller with a menu of call routing options. The menu of call routing options permits the caller to route the call, i.e., selectively call forward the call, to other extensions or other services, e.g., a pager or central office voice mail or perhaps another of central office services.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-

Art Unit: 2642


5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
August 5, 2003


JACK CHIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER